



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,733	06/30/2005	Christine Wild	C 2507 PCT/US	6029
23657	7590	03/18/2008	EXAMINER	
COGNIS CORPORATION			AHMED, HASAN SYED	
PATENT DEPARTMENT				
300 BROOKSIDE AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AMBLER, PA 19002			1618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/517,733	WILD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HASAN S. AHMED	1618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 16-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21,29 and 33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 16-20,22-28 and 30-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/8/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of applicants' IDS, which was filed on 8 December 2004 and response, which was filed on 19 February 2008.

* * * * *

Election/Restrictions

Applicants' election without traverse of Group I and claim 22 in the reply filed on 19 February 2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 21, 29, and 33 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 19 February 2008.

* * * * *

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16, 17, 22-27, 30, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,749,860 ("Tyrrell").

Tyrrell teaches an absorbent article comprising:

- the synthetic waxes of instant claim 16(a) (see col. 5, lines 30-48);

- the alkoxylated derivatives of fatty acid esters of instant claim 16(b) (see col. 7, lines 4-19);
- the polymeric waxes of instant claim 16(c) (see col. 12, lines 45-54);
- the melting point of instant claim 17 (see col. 7, line 24);
- the melting point of instant claim 24 (see col. 11, line 53);
- the silicone wax of instant claim 25 (see col. 28, line 10);
- the skincare substances of instant claim 26 (see col. 29, line 53 - col. 30, line 17);
- the water of instant claims 27 and 35 (see col. 51, line 1); and
- the polyethylene nonwoven of instant claim 30 (see col. 25, line 19);

Tyrrell explains that the disclosed composition is beneficial because it has improved transfer from the bodyfacing materials of disposable absorbent articles to the skin (see col. 1, lines 18-21).

While Tyrrell does not explicitly teach the polyvinyl stearyl ether of instant claim 22, the polyoxyethylene stearyl ether disclosed by Tyrrell (see col. 8, lines 44-45) is deemed to be its functional equivalent, since both are polyethylene stearyl ethers.

While Tyrrell does not explicitly teach the percentages of instant claims 16, 23, 25-27, or 35, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine suitable percentages through routine or manipulative experimentation to obtain the best possible results, as these are variable parameters attainable within the art.

Moreover, generally, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. “[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456; 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Applicants have not demonstrated any unexpected or unusual results, which accrue from the instant percentage ranges.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to disclose a composition comprising synthetic waxes, alkoxyLATED derivatives of fatty alcohols, and polymeric waxes, as taught by Tyrrell. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make such a composition because it has improved transfer from the bodyfacing materials of disposable absorbent articles to the skin, as explained by Tyrrelle.

*

Claims 16, 18, 19, 20, 28, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,749,860 (“Tyrrell”) in view of U.S. Application No. 2002/005816 (“Hisanaka”).

Tyrrell teaches an absorbent article (see above).

Tyrrell differs from the instant application in that it does not disclose the fatty acid glycerides of instant claims 18, 19, 31, and 32 or the coconut fatty acid esters of instant claims 20 and 28. However use of these compounds in compositions that are solid at

21°C were known at the time the instant application was filed, as evinced by Hisanaka (see paragraph 0040).

While Hisanaka does not explicitly teach the percentages of instant claim 28, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine suitable percentages through routine or manipulative experimentation to obtain the best possible results, as these are variable parameters attainable within the art.

Moreover, generally, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. “[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456; 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Applicants have not demonstrated any unexpected or unusual results, which accrue from the instant percentage ranges.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to disclose a composition comprising fatty acid glycerides, esters of coconut fatty acids, and polymeric waxes, as taught by Tyrrell in view of Hisanaka. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make such a composition because it has improved transfer from the bodyfacing materials of disposable absorbent articles to the skin, as explained by Tyrrelle.

* * * * *

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 16-20, 22-28, and 30-35 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-52 of copending Application No. 10/458,651 ('651). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '651 teaches a composition comprising synthetic waxes, alkoxylated derivatives of fatty alcohols, and polymeric waxes (see claim 1).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.



Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HASAN S. AHMED whose telephone number is (571)272-4792. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Hartley can be reached on (571)272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. S. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 1618

/Humera N. Sheikh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1618